



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, March, 1887.

THE MODERN LANGUAGES IN UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE AND SECONDARY SCHOOL;

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THEIR ORAL
USE.

"The authority of experts is a characteristic of our time."

DR. F. A. MARCH.

The study of living languages and their literature admits of such a variety of conceptions as to its scope and aims, that it is not at all strange that many a teacher should feel uncertain about the proper limits and methods of his work. When we consider, on the one hand, that the study of the historical development of a single language, or of the works of one author, may occupy the time and tax the energy of a scholar for years, and, on the other hand, that the acquisition of a practical knowledge of one or two languages requires, as a rule, years of study and practice; how can it surprise us that a teacher should hesitate time and again, and vacillate between the "theoretical" and the "practical," whenever he finds it impossible to dwell with his class upon both?

But while the nature of the study, with its numerous ramifications and manifold uses in its advanced stage, is one of the causes which make the definition of aim and method in the more elementary part of the instruction difficult, another cause is to be found in the lack of order and system in the apportionment of the work to the various educational institutions.

Having, for my own satisfaction, tried to arrive at a better understanding of what may be called the intelligent opinion of the profession on this subject, I intend in the following pages to give an account of my way of proceeding and of such results as I think may be of interest to others.

The study of modern languages naturally divides itself into two parts: the elementary study, and the higher. The former includes pronunciation, grammar, and the reading of

literary productions mainly as a means of learning the language. The higher work embraces the historical and philological study of the languages, and the historical and critical study of their literatures. I do not, for the moment, assign any place to conversational exercises as part of the instruction, and I shall not consider at all the purely practical, unscientific pursuit of the languages, because, in my opinion, it has no legitimate place in any of the institutions with which I am here concerned.

The institutions in which the languages are mainly taught are the university, the college, and the high school; and, in order to determine which portion of the instruction belongs to each of them, it becomes necessary first to define the character and functions of each.

What is a university? What is a college? In no country in the world is it so difficult to answer these questions as in the United States; at least the ideas conveyed by those names to the popular mind are absolutely indefinite, and even many professors would probably be unable to give satisfactory answers to the above questions.¹ Nevertheless, so much has of late been said and written concerning the proper spheres of the higher institutions of learning, that we are able to gather from the opinions of the foremost scholars of the country sufficient data to form a conception if not of what the American university and college are, at least of what they should be.

In the first place, the university is more than a college. The latter,—whether taken in the historical sense, as one of the halls of the university, or in the etymological, "a body of men, particularly students, gathered together," or in the modern sense, as the place where one goes to learn "something about everything,"—constitutes either the basis or a part of the university.² The idea of the university, in the words of President Daniel C. Gilman, is "an association, by authority, of Masters, who

¹ Arthur S. Bolles; *Atlantic Monthly*. Vol. LII, p. 686. What Instruction should be given in our Colleges?

² R. R. Bowker, *The College of To-day*; *Princeton Review*, 1884, p. 102.

Daniel C. Gilman, *The Idea of the University*; *North American Review*. Vol. CXXXIII, p. 357.

are conspicuous in ability, learning, and devotion to study, for the intellectual guidance, in many subjects, of youthful scholars who have been prepared for the freedom of investigation by prolonged discipline in literature and science." . . . "Instruction by investigation is the key-note of university life."³

The "prolonged discipline in literature and science" must of course be gotten at the college or in the secondary schools. If this definition of the university approaches at all the idea in the mind of American scholars—which it no doubt does—it is at once evident that the elementary study of the modern languages does not belong in the university: it must be relegated either to the college or to the high schools.

But even the college, if it be recognized as an institution distinct from the secondary school, cannot be considered as the proper place for rudimentary work in the living languages, unless, indeed, the latter be regarded as a branch of knowledge of a higher order than the ancient languages, the advanced work in which only is included in the college curriculum. There is then no denying the justice of the demand that all college work in the modern languages should be pursued on a thorough historical basis,⁴ and that "the province of instruction in our college should be to . . . carry forward the student to an intelligent study of the literature and philology of those languages."⁵

The secondary schools are the only institutions in which the elementary study of the modern language may be legitimately pursued:

"They [the high schools] should embrace every useful branch suited to young men and women under sixteen or eighteen years of age—English composition, English language, history, classics, modern languages, and elementary science."⁶

³ The Idea of the University; North American Review. Vol. CXXXIII, p. 355, f.

⁴ A. M. Elliott, Modern Languages as a College Discipline; Education. Vol. V, No. 1, p. 54.

⁵ W. T. Hewett, Proceedings Modern Language Association of America, 1884, p. 40.

⁶ Dr. McCosh, before the National Teachers' Association. Elmira, N. Y., 1873.

"French and German should be taught in the preparatory schools."⁷

"When the secondary schools take their proper place in the system of American education, and provide . . . all the elementary instruction indispensable to a liberal education, including the elements of all the languages and sciences which a boy of eighteen, whose education is to be prolonged until he is twenty-five or twenty-six, ought to know— . . . it will be possible to reduce the period of study. . . ,"⁸ etc.⁸

"The elementary study of both French and German should be remanded to the public schools."⁹ The same view is expressed in the report of a committee submitted at the meeting of The Modern Language Association of America in December, 1885.¹⁰ This report, prepared mainly by Dr. W. T. Hewett, of Cornell University, furnishes also highly interesting statistics concerning the actual condition of the instruction in the modern languages in American colleges and universities. From these it appears that but few colleges require any French or German for admission; that, while a number of these institutions offer instruction in the modern languages in the freshman year, a larger proportion do not begin the study till the sophomore year, and a few defer it till the junior, or even the senior year. In other words, in a great majority of the educational institutions of the highest order in the United States, there are to be found professors, learned professors in many cases without doubt, engaged in teaching the German alphabet, the conjugation of *j'ai, tu as, il a*, and the declension of *der, die, das*. Well might a professor in one of the leading universities in the West say that "the present state of higher education in America can be briefly comprehended in one word—chaos;" and that the university is "loaded down—handicapped with a vast

⁷ President Chas. W. Eliot; What is a Liberal Education; The Century, June, 1884, p. 102.

⁸ President Chas. W. Eliot, North American Review. Vol. CXXVI, p. 222.

⁹ W. T. Hewett, Proceedings Modern Languages Association, 1884, p. 40.

¹⁰ Proceedings, 1885, p. 7.

burden of work which has no place in genuine universities."¹¹

What are the reasons, or shall I say the excuses, for such a state of things? If Professor Huxley claims that in an ideal university "all sources of knowledge, and all aids to learning, should be accessible to all comers,"¹² his words cannot reasonably be interpreted as meaning that any boy (or girl), however deficient in elementary knowledge, who chooses to go to a university, has a right to call there for just such instruction as is suited to him. And yet there may be, in this country especially, cogent reasons why institutions should sometimes do work not properly falling within their sphere. "The common school," says President Johnston, . . . "gives the elementary instruction. The secondary school should begin the work of differentiation in courses of study, which branch out as you rise in the scale through high school and college to the university, where the work becomes special and professional. The common school gives the general education, the secondary schools the higher education, and the university the highest of all."

"But the university has still another function . . . it has much work to do which may be called supplementary work which is not done or cannot be done by primary or secondary schools, for lack of means or other sufficient cause."¹³

Does the elementary work in French and German, to which so much time is devoted in many colleges and universities, come under this head? The principal excuse for the existing state of things is without doubt to be found in the real or supposed inability of the preparatory schools to do the work: "the traditional requirements [for admission] in most colleges remained unchanged. A doubt existed of the capacity of training schools to meet this new requirement."¹⁴ On the other hand, it is the university, or the college, that

gives direction to the instruction in the public schools, and to do so is one of its special missions. "No great university," says Charles K. Adams, "can afford to forget that a part of its work is the elevation of the preparatory schools."¹⁵ If the common schools are not in this country "the intellectual offspring" of the universities (as they are in most countries), the latter certainly have much to do with the moulding of the former; for "the law of educational history is that the higher institutions and the higher demands everywhere condition and prescribe the character of the lower."¹⁶ And so in the case of the modern languages, experience has shown that where requirements for better preparation were made by the universities, the secondary schools have, in the course of a few years, met these requirements.

To show how the secondary schools, with their already crowded courses, can accommodate themselves to such additional requisitions on the part of college and university, lies outside the purpose of this paper. But it must be pretty clear to most minds that the high schools will soon have to decide either on further differentiation in courses of study, or on returning to a simpler condition of affairs, that is, on confining their instruction more to such branches as are really preparatory for any kind of higher work. Perhaps the time will soon come when people will think again as Goethe thought many years ago, when he wrote: "The injury which is done by leading young people too far in many studies, has still more shown itself later, when time and attention were withdrawn from language studies and the rudiments in actual preparatory branches, in order to devote them to so-called practical studies, which are rather diverting than educating, unless the instruction in them is systematic and complete."¹⁷ One thing is certain, viz., that, if the universities expect ever to do the kind of work which legitimately belongs to them, they can do so only by leaving to the secondary schools the work properly belonging to them.

It is not at all strange that the various efforts on the part of colleges and universities to meet the demands made upon them by the public

¹¹ The University—How and What? By W. W. Folwell, LL.D., University of Minnesota; Education, Vol. IV, p. 309 f.

¹² Inaugural Address of the Lord Rector of the University of Aberdeen, 1874.

¹³ President W. P. Johnston, of Tulane University, New Orleans. Education. Vol. V, p. 518, f.

¹⁴ W. T. Hewett, in the Report above referred to.

¹⁵ North American Review, Oct. 1875.

¹⁶ See Report Proceedings Modern Lang. Association, 1885.

¹⁷ Wahrheit und Dichtung, Erstes Semester in Leipzig.

should lead to some confusion of ideas and that, consequently, the appropriate methods of instruction should also be somewhat confounded.¹⁸ If the college is about half college and half secondary school, and the university partly university, partly college, and partly secondary school, it can but seem natural that professors should occasionally apply methods of instruction peculiarly adapted to one class of work also to another class, university methods to secondary work, or vice-versa. How far this is true with reference to the modern languages cannot be ascertained without a close inquiry into the methods employed by a large number of university or college instructors. But as far as I can judge from information at hand, there is essential unanimity among leading professors in regard to one important factor in the instruction of living languages, viz.: their oral use.

It is hardly necessary to say that the class of men to whom I refer, and the opinions of some of whom I shall presently quote, do not hold that a university or college curriculum which is not strictly professional, can be made a *direct* preparation for life. They cannot be suspected of narrow, utilitarian views. There is no doubt that they would in the main adopt Noah Porter's definition of usefulness, as contained in the following passage: "We are not opposed to trying every method and study by the criterion of usefulness, but we would always interpose the question, *useful for what?* We believe that those studies and that discipline which are the most useful to train to manly thinking, to nice discrimination, and simple diction, as well as to noble purposes, and an enlarged acquaintance with man and his history, are the most useful studies in fact: while the criterion of direct service in the exercise of one's immediate trade, calling, or profession, is sophistical and misleading."¹⁹

It is in this spirit that the following opinions as to the value of oral practice in the instruction in modern languages are to be understood.

At the convention of professors of modern languages held on Dec. 27 and 28, 1883, in Columbia College, a resolution was passed

without dissent to the effect that in colleges and universities the "primary aims of instruction in the modern languages should be literary culture, philological scholarship, and linguistic discipline, but that oral practice is desirable as an auxiliary."²⁰

Dr. W. T. Hewett, Cornell University: "The teaching of a language conversationally should . . . hold a subordinate place in instruction; it is, however, important when used to supplement other methods and to train the ear to understand the spoken language. With this end in view, familiar explanations and lectures in the language itself are desirable at every point of the course."²¹

The late Prof. Wm. Cook, Mass. Institute of Technology: "I will teach my students rather to *read* the language than to speak or write it,—and next to reading it, I will teach them to *understand* it when spoken or read aloud."²²

Prof. Calvin Thomas, University of Michigan: "In no other way [viz.: than by oral practice, etc.] is a true feeling for the language, a proper *Sprachgefühl*, to be acquired. But this work should not be a mere empirical imitation of the teacher or of the book. It should appeal to the learner's intellect as well as store his memory and discipline his vocal organs."²³

Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College: "A thorough course in German should mean an intelligent acquisition of its sounds, the writing and speaking of the language, the reading of masterpieces of German literature," etc.²⁴

Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann, Earlham College: "The student . . . becomes acquainted with the *spoken* language. This is of no mean

²⁰ The Nation. Vol. XXXVIII, p. 14.

²¹ Proceedings Modern Language Association, 1884, p. 42.

²² Proceedings Modern Language Association, 1885, p. 18.

²³ The Michigan School Moderator, No. 218.—It should be stated that the tenor of Prof. Thomas' article here referred to is rather to protest against attaching too much value to a conversational knowledge of a language. "For myself (he says) I can say with perfect sincerity that I look upon my own ability to speak German simply as an accomplishment to which I attach no great importance."—I cannot help thinking that Prof. Thomas is in error. There is no doubt in my mind that, unconsciously, he owes his lively interest and brilliant scholarship in the German language and literature, and especially his fine "feeling for the language" in part to his ability to speak the language.

²⁴ Proceedings Modern Language Association, 1884, p. 23.

¹⁸ See The Idea of the University, by Daniel C. Gilman.

¹⁹ The American Colleges and the American Public; New Edition; pp. 271, 272.

importance. Modern philology is based upon the spoken language, not upon the literary speech. Without knowing the spoken language, we cannot rightly understand a people's great literary productions."²⁵

Prof. James King Newton, Oberlin College: "But the easy sentence . . . is not mastered when the thought is apprehended and translated into English. The legitimate work on it is done only when it is so learned and so comprehended that the mind has gotten out of it the facile use of the verb and of the idiom involved."

"For teacher and student the comparison lies between understanding and being able to translate into adequate English a Greek sentence, and understanding, being able to translate, being able to think, and to use in speech, a German sentence." This he calls "the only proper and legitimate way of weighing things."²⁶

Dr. Faulhaber, Phillips Exeter Academy: "It is only through the spoken word that the spirit of the language can be seized, only in the struggle to clothe one's thoughts in the dress of the foreign tongue that the living power of human speech can be realized."²⁷

Prof. Cohn, of Harvard University, "would most heartily approve of the general line of opinions as set forth in these essays,"²⁸ the tenor of the essays in question being, in the main, that of the above extracts.

In German schools, wherever the acquisition of the language itself, not of its history, literature, or philology, is the chief end of instruction, the methods in use are such as to impress the student with the fact that he is learning a *living* language. The systematic work is usually supplemented by more or less colloquial practice, and such practice is countenanced and recommended by university professors. Says Dr. Bernhard Schmitz: ²⁹

"Ich lasse also diese Übungen [viz.: Sprechübungen] zuerst in Quarta oder wenigstens, wenn es nicht anders sein kann, in Tertia

eintreten . . . In dem höhern pädagogischen Unterricht schliessen sich die Sprechübungen hauptsächlich theils der Lectüre, theils den grammatischen Repetitionen an. Wenigstens müssen am Ende jeder Lehrstunde einige Fragen in der fremden Sprache an die Schüler gerichtet und von diesen beantwortet werden."

He is aware that instructors often neglect these conversational exercises, ostensibly on the ground of "higher pedagogical wisdom," but really on account of the inherent difficulties: "Wegen der Schwierigkeiten . . . nimmt man die Miene einer höhern pädagogischen Weisheit an und verschmäh't vornehm den berechtigten Forderungen Rechnung zu tragen."³⁰

Difficult and unpleasant though the task may be for many professors, it would seem that Dr. Schmitz is correct in calling the demand for some colloquial use of the modern languages a just one. In the same sense R. R. Bowker expresses himself as follows: "The construction of these languages [French and German], and their literatures, should be treated of fully, and, while the college cannot be expected to make expert conversationalists in French and German, it is natural and proper that living languages should to some extent be studied in practical speech."³¹

Whether or not the university and college professors above quoted, and others who bear testimony by word or deed to the value of the oral use of living languages in connection with the theoretical study, are partly influenced in their opinions by motives of expediency, it is certainly fortunate that they advocate methods tending to prevent an estrangement between the colleges and the people. In this country more than in any other "they [the colleges] must take heed to themselves lest they fall out of that intimate relation to the life of the nation in which they once stood, and out of which

³⁰ Dr. Schmitz (Encyl., Vierter Theil, p. 181) gives an amusing quotation to show that the difficulties referred to are not now experienced for the first time. The words are Rector Schatzens (Frankfort a. M., 1724): "Was aber das Reden anlangt, so thun sich hierinnen insgemein die meisten *Difficultäten* hervor, weilen es den meisten Lehrern an den nütlichen Mitteln fehlet, den *Scholaren* das Maul aufzubrechen, welches ihnen um diese Zeit (in den obern Classen!) insgemein hart zugefroren ist."

³¹ The College of To-Day; Princeton Rev., 1884, p. 102.

²⁵ Proceedings Modern Language Association, 1885, p. 20.

²⁶ A Plea for a Liberal Education, Modern Language Series, No. I.

²⁷ Proceedings Modern Language Association, 1885, p. 21.

²⁸ Proceedings Modern Language Association, 1885, p. 22.

²⁹ Encyclopädie des philologischen Studiums der neueren Sprachen; 2te Auflage, Leipzig, 1876.

they have no importance or value at all.”³² “Between college and life there should be no gap. The ending of every system of instruction, whatever it may be, should naturally lap on to the sphere of those broader and more varied duties that crowd upon the man in the fierce battle of his after-life.”³³

But to confine the work in such eminently practical studies as that of the modern languages, *entirely* within scientific and theoretical limits, would be unnecessarily making “a gap between college and life”—unnecessarily indeed, unless “higher pedagogical wisdom” really dictated such a course. But this is far from being the case. Pedagogical psychology, experience, the highest professional authority, all point to the opposite course. Eminent teachers of the modern languages³⁴ have quite recently pointed out that the discipline attainable from their study is of two or three different kinds: there is a kind of discipline to be gained from the study of the grammar and from the grammatical analysis of authors; another from the exact analysis of foreign sounds; and still another from such mastery of the language as to make it almost a second mother-tongue, to enter into the spirit of the living language and its literature. The second and third are peculiar to the study of *living* languages. But the educational value of a speaking knowledge of a language depends upon the method by which it is *acquired*; if acquired in a mechanical way it yields but little mental discipline, while if, in learning to speak, the student is held to make use of all his mental powers, the practice is of disciplinary value similar to, but higher than the writing of grammatical exercises.

If Henry Sweet rests the claims of phonetics to be considered an essential branch of education mainly on its value as the foundation of the practical study of language,³⁵ and, on the other hand, complains that viva-voce instruction is too much neglected in teaching language,³⁶ we are reminded of the intimate relation between the study of phonetics and col-

loquial language. “Careful hearing and speaking leads the pupil to fine distinctions of the quality of sounds and to their rapid discrimination when occurring in succession—in short to a refinement of the auditory sense, combined with a delicacy in the muscular sensibility and flexibility of the vocal organ.”³⁷

As to the third kind of discipline to be derived from the study of living language, every thoughtful person who has studied either ancient or modern languages sufficiently to have even an imperfect speaking knowledge of them, must have felt the great help such attainment afforded him in his genuine appreciation of foreign literature. Thought and *speech* are so closely allied that we can far better think the thoughts presented to us in a foreign language when we are able to speak that language than without such ability.³⁸ By devoting part of the time, during the entire course, to oral practice, the student will learn to read more rapidly and understand more clearly what he is reading; without conversation, the language he is studying will never impress him as a living one, similar to his own mother-tongue. A speaking knowledge is “a key to a facile acquaintance with the literature.”³⁹ Or, to express it again in the words of the psychologist: “The accuracy and facility of thinking [which is, of course, a *sine qua non* for the accurate understanding of literature] turn in no small measure on the fine discrimination and distinct reproduction of sounds together with the correlated vocal actions, and on their flexibility and susceptibility of combination in easily apprehended series.”⁴⁰

At the present stage of modern language study in the United States, there is probably no institution in which the oral use of the languages can be rightfully omitted from the course of instruction. We shall be better able to determine where and when this part of the work ought to receive especial attention, when the lines between the curricula of the high school, the college, and the university are somewhat more definitely drawn. It seems very desirable that this be done; not with the

³² William G. Sumner; Princeton Rev., 1884, p. 140.

³³ A. M. Elliott; Education. Vol. V, p. 55.

³⁴ Hewett; Brandt.

³⁵ Preface to *Hand Book of Phonetics*.

³⁶ Thirteenth Annual Address of the President of the Philological Society (English), p. 93.

³⁷ J. Sully, Psychology (N. Y., 1884), p. 249.

³⁸ Cf. Sully, Psychology, pp. 337, 350.

³⁹ The Academy (Syracuse, N. Y.). Vol. I, 9; pp. 338, 343.

⁴⁰ Sully, p. 348.

expectation of seeing every institution in the land immediately, or in the near future, range itself within its proper limits, but in order to define more clearly than has hitherto been done the aims toward which instructors ought to strive. If the universities cannot rid themselves of all elementary instruction, let them at least make known what portion of the course they retain under protest, and what they consider their legitimate work.

A. LODEMAN.

Ypsilanti, Mich.

THE GERUNDIAL CONSTRUCTION IN THE ROMANIC LANGUAGES.

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

HE who enters upon an investigation in philology, where the subject concerns the language of early writers, whose works have been preserved to us in manuscript form, is not infrequently met on the very threshold of his inquiry by a consideration which must in no small degree tend to dampen his ardor—I mean the uncertainty, in the event of his not having access to the manuscripts, of the value of the forms given by the editions he intends to follow, as compared with the actual forms which may have been used by the authors themselves. The notorious negligence of the middle-age copyists and their frequent tampering with the texts of their authors, either to satisfy their own personal whims or through ignorance of the language or dialect of the writers whose productions they essayed to multiply, are too well known to need much comment here. Add to this that even some of the men of the present day who undertake the editing of such manuscripts, are often as capricious and dishonest in making up their editions as the old copyists themselves, and the investigator may well have cause to doubt the value of his conclusions, even when most carefully drawn. Mr. L. Clédât has just given us a fine specimen of this *cacoethes emendandi* in his edition of the *Chanson de Roland* lately published. (Paris, Garnier, 1886.) Acting on the assumption that “la majorité des romanistes” consider the *Roland* of French origin, which, to say the least, is very questionable,

he proceeds to francisize the Oxford text on the model of the French of the eleventh century, from which modern French proper is derived. The result is not simply a “nouvelle édition,” as he styles it, but likewise an “édition neuve.” But this method of procedure is not confined to this species of writings; it is a mania that has extended to more recent authors as well. Very few of the ordinary editions of modern classic authors, for instance, would be trustworthy for philological investigation. We all know of Bentley’s unhappy attempt at emending the text of Milton. Some copyists and editors seem to have adopted the principle that any decided deviation in point of spelling or syntax, not current at their time, was an indication that the author did not know what was right and must needs be corrected by his more fortunate successors. In this way many of the most important works of early writers have been lost to us, as far as the original form is concerned, and their value for philological purposes is accordingly diminished in proportion to the amount of mutilation suffered. As an additional instance of how one of the old French authors has been treated by a modern editor, may be cited the case of the *Roman de Rou*, edited and published over fifty years ago by Pluquet.

Wace’s poem is preserved in a manuscript known as the Duchesne MS. (because copied by André Duchesne from an earlier MS.), which belongs to the “Bibliothèque Nationale” at Paris. Pluquet professed to have made this MS. the basis of his edition; but a new edition has been, within the last decade, gotten out by a German savant (Hugo Andresen), who found, by a comparison of Pluquet’s text with Duchesne’s, that by no possibility could he have consulted (or at least followed) this MS. for the readings which he attributed to it, since many of these readings are not to be found there, even when he refers specially to Duchesne in his foot notes. A close examination showed that Pluquet had been guilty of the most unparalleled dishonesty; that instead of basing his edition on Duchesne’s text, he had followed in great measure the worst of the three existing copies, made from the Duchesne; and further that he had even taken the most unwarrantable liber-